

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/644,849	08/21/2003	Szu-Han Wu	WUSZ3001/EM	6156
23364 7590 01/04/2007 BACON & THOMAS, PLLC 625 SLATERS LANE FOURTH FLOOR ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER	
			KIM, ANDREW	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	3714	
SHORTENED STATUTORY	PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE
3 MON	THS .	01/04/2007	PAF	PER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

			,			
	÷ .	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/644,849	WU, SZU-HAN			
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Andrew Kim	3714			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SH WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING Donsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. It is to reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period or the toreply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing ed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		ı				
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 A	uaust 2003.				
	_	action is non-final.				
3)	/ -					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositi	ion of Claims	•				
	Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application	•				
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
·	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-10</u> is/are rejected.					
	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.				
Applicati	ion Papers					
	The specification is objected to by the Examine	ar.				
•	The drawing(s) filed on <u>21 August 2003</u> is/are:		to by the Examiner			
10/63	Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct					
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex					
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
, —	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).			
~,	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No.					
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio	rity documents have been receive	ed in this National Stage			
	application from the International Bureau	u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).				
* (See the attached detailed Office action for a list	of the certified copies not receive	ed.			
Attachmen						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D				
3) Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/644,849

Art Unit: 3714

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers ("Using Handhelds and PCs Together", 2001).

Myers discloses how personal handheld computers (personal data assistants "PDA" and cell phones) interoperate with desktop and built-in computers seamlessly in real time.

Claims 1, 2, 6. Myers discloses a method for simulating a joystick of a computer by means of a portable electronic device, comprising the step of in response to interconnecting the portable electronic device and the computer under a current

Application/Control Number: 10/644,849

Art Unit: 3714

connecting mode and receiving a confirmation instruction for activating a joystick simulation, causing the portable electronic device to perform the steps of:

initializing the communication interface and sending a joystick ID to the computer (page 36, col. 1); The PDA must initialize a communication interface such as a serial cable, or wirelessly to communicate with the computer. Additionally, an joystick ID must be sent such that the computer may accept output from the PDA in order to control functions on the computer.

setting a plurality of keys on a keypad of the portable electronic device as a plurality of game keys and a game interrupt key so as to finish the interconnection between the portable electronic device and the computer and the setting in simulating the portable electronic device as an associated joystick of the computer. The keys of the PDA must be set to control the computer such that it may change the slides. An interrupt function must also be implemented such that the computer and the PDA can disconnect safely.

Myers substantially discloses the invention as claimed but fails to explicitly teach:

determining whether the portable electronic device is connecting to the computer under one of other predetermined connecting modes;

terminating the current connecting mode if the determination is positive;

However, it is old and well known in the art that these events need to take place for the device to change the function of the device and how the computer perceives the device.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have seen the benefit of

Art Unit: 3714

changing the ID of the connected portable device in case it was already connected as a PDA. Such a situation would allow the computer react more efficiently to any output from the portable device.

Claim 3. Myers substantially discloses the invention as claimed but fails to explicitly teach wherein in response to setting the plurality of keys on the keypad of the portable electronic device as a plurality of game keys and a game interrupt key, a pressing of a functional key of the keys will issue a pressing signal and will cause the portable electronic device to perform the steps of: reading the pressing signal; determining a source of the pressing signal; in response to determining the pressing signal is issued by pressing the functional key, determining whether the functional key has been set as one of the plurality of game keys; and sending a data package associated with the pressing signal to the computer prior to reading a pressing signal issued by pressing another functional key of the keys if the determination whether the functional key has been set as one of the plurality of game keys is positive. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have seen the benefit of implementing the pressing of keys this way to provide the user with a method to send commands and to make sure that the first command is sent before a second one is sent.

Claim 4. Myers substantially discloses the invention as claimed but fails to explicitly teach the step of determining whether the functional key has been set as the game interrupt key if the determination whether the functional key has been set as one of the plurality of game keys is negative. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have seen the benefit of determining whether the functional key has

Application/Control Number: 10/644,849

Art Unit: 3714

been set to prevent a functional key being set as the same as a game interrupt key.

Such a situation would be disadvantageous to the user because the PDA will mistakenly rescind its joystick ID which would change the function of the PDA.

Claim 5. Myers substantially discloses the invention as claimed but fails to explicitly teach the steps of terminating the interconnection between the portable electronic device and the computer and returning to the previous connecting mode interconnected the portable electronic device and the computer if the determination whether the functional key has been set as the game interrupt key is positive. However, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have seen the benefit of the interrupt key functioning this way to reset the ID of how the computer perceives the PDA.

Claim 7. Myers discloses wherein the portable electronic device is a PDA (Personal Digital Assistant) (pg. 35, col. 1).

Claim 8. Myers discloses wherein the portable electronic device is a mobile phone (pg. 35, col. 1).

Claim 9. Myers discloses wherein the communication interface is a transmission line (pg. 36, col. 1).

Claim 10. Myers discloses wherein the communication interface is a wireless communication element (pg. 36, col. 1).

Art Unit: 3714

Citations

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

http://www.pebbles.hcii.cmu.edu/software/remotecmd/index.php - Remote commander, uses a PDA as a remote control for the computer.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-1691. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Bob Olszewski can be reached on 571-272-6788. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3714

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Scott E. June

AK 12/26/2006

PALMARY EXAMINER